



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
Bureau of Land Management

Baker District Office  
P.O. Box 987  
Baker, Oregon 97814



---

# Rangeland Program Summary **(RPS)** Record of Decision

Ironside EIS Area  
Baker District



## Abstract

This Rangeland Program Summary (RPS) constitutes the public record of decision and summarizes the major range management actions to be taken on approximately 380,000 acres of public land in the Baker Resource Area of the Baker District. The actions are designed to reach the general objectives identified in the proposed action described in the Ironside Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The actions included in this decision also incorporate many of the findings of the EIS as well as public comments on the draft RPS and the consultation meetings with permittees and other interested groups.

Public participation and Advisory Council recommendations have resulted in significant changes from the Draft Rangeland Program Summary issued last March. Instead of large grazing use reductions followed by initiation of grazing systems, the final decision includes major changes in livestock management, some grazing use reductions, initiation of grazing systems, and monitoring of resource conditions to assure that objectives are being met. Where satisfactory progress is not being made, adjustments in grazing use will be made by the end of the five year implementation period.

This document also displays several other changes from the draft RPS. A reduced number of allotments are identified for intensive management as well as a reduced range improvement program. These changes were made to balance the costs of the proposed level of management with the benefits to be attained. Intensive management and the expenditure of range improvement funds will be limited to allotments where resource concerns exist and where the benefits will exceed the costs. Permittee participation in the maintenance of existing range improvement projects and the construction of new projects will be increased. Permittees have also committed to increased levels of on-the-ground management so that progress towards the management objectives can still be accomplished in the austere budgetary climate that is expected during the implementation period of this rangeland program.

Although most of the resource data used in the Ironside planning documents and EIS was gathered between 1975 and 1978, the forage production information was much older and therefore not suitable for establishing reliable stocking rates. As a result, range studies were initiated in 1978. These studies indicate that resource concerns are localized and that significant improvement has occurred on most of the public land acreage in the last 20 - 30 years. However, these studies did not provide sufficient data to determine the size of any needed livestock reductions. Consequently, some of the reductions will be postponed for up to 3 years to provide time to collect monitoring data to determine if the management change approach will maintain and improve resource conditions.

The initial authorized annual livestock grazing use will be 51,179 animal unit months (AUMs). This represents an increase of almost 2,400 AUMs on 28 allotments and an increase of about 1,800 AUMs on 16 allotments based on the 1978 authorized use of 50,577 AUMs.

Individual allotment decisions implementing the rangeland program will be issued in January 1982. These decisions will include individual allotment use and management adjustments that will be effective March 1, 1982, as well as those that will be phased in over a period of five years or less.

Intensive management, which is initiation of grazing systems and may include the construction of range improvements, will be implemented on 88 allotments covering nearly 322,000 acres. Two of these allotments covering almost 11,000 acres will be managed under the Experimental Stewardship Program. Nonintensive management which consists of custodial livestock management, will continue on 169 allotments covering about 50,000 acres. Livestock grazing was removed from one allotment covering 2,609 acres. Approximately 8,600 acres will be in enclosures and other areas unallotted for livestock use.





The following rangeland improvements are planned: 14,070 acres of seedings, 20,630 acres of brush control, 64 miles of fence, 5 cattleguards, 92 spring developments, 2 wells, 15 reservoirs, 1 guzzler, and 41 miles of pipeline. Environmental assessments will be prepared prior to construction of range improvements or significant modifications of the range management program.

Resource monitoring studies and evaluations will be conducted following implementation of grazing systems and range improvements to determine if objectives are being met. Where progress toward meeting the objectives is not being met, adjustments in the program will be made. A report of the progress made toward implementing this program and improving resource conditions will be prepared periodically and published in future Rangeland Program Summary Updates.

## Introduction

### Purpose

This Rangeland Program Summary (RPS) briefly describes the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) program relating to range management in the Baker District's portion of the Ironside Grazing Management Environmental Impact Statement (Ironside EIS) area in eastern Oregon. It also constitutes the public record of decision on grazing management in that portion of the EIS area. This program consists of four parts:

- 1) The allocation of vegetation for livestock, wildlife and nonconsumptive uses,
- 2) The grazing systems to be implemented,
- 3) The range improvements to be constructed,
- 4) The monitoring and evaluation program to be conducted.

The RPS also describes how the Initial and subsequent grazing decisions needed to implement the program will be made.

The Ironside EIS area encompasses public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in both Baker County and the northern portion of Malheur County. Range management decisions concerning the Vale District portion of the EIS area are covered in a separate RPS prepared by the Vale District.

The Ironside EIS was prepared in compliance with the BLM - Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) agreement dated April 11, 1975. The Ironside EIS completed in 1980 analyzed the proposed action and five alternatives. It included resource data primarily gathered prior to 1979.

Please refer to the Ironside EIS for a more detailed description of the proposed action (which has been adopted with certain modifications), the five alternatives and definition of terms.

### Background

Baker Resource Area consists of about 380,000

acres of public land which makes up 19 percent of Baker County, Oregon. The grazing allotments in the area also contain almost 200,000 acres in other ownership. These public lands consist primarily of various size tracts widely scattered throughout the county. This scattered pattern is the result of the selective process of the homesteading laws. The more arid and steeper lands were not homesteaded and stayed in public ownership.

At present there are 163 livestock operators authorized to obtain 50,577 AUMs of livestock forage from public land in 258 grazing allotments.

Range improvement projects completed prior to 1980 include 405 miles of fence, 25,268 acres of grass seedings, 22,678 acres of brush spraying, 455 water developments, 82 cattleguards and 31 wildlife exclosures covering 1,272 acres.

On most of the allotments, forage resource surveys in the 1950s and early 1960s serve as the most recent forage inventory base. Livestock use



## Ecosite Condition in 1977

	Climax	Late	Middle	Early	Condition Not Determined
Acres:	15,099	79,272	105,696	109,471	70,848
Percent:	4	26	34	36	

## Trend of Ecosite Condition in 1977

	Improving Condition	Static Condition	Deteriorating Condition	Trend Not Determined
Acres:	139,669	181,193	41,524	18,000
Percent	39	50	11	

adjustments based on these inventories resulted in a 40 percent reduction (34,281 AUMs) during the 1956-1966 period.

The effects of these past livestock adjustments, implementation of grazing systems and construction of range improvement projects have resulted in the following resource condition and trend. Changes which may have occurred since 1977 are not reflected in this data.

Deer and elk are the primary big game species, while antelope occur in small numbers. Chukar partridge and a variety of other upland game birds inhabit the area along with some waterfowl, fur bearers, and numerous non-game species.

A number of streams in the area provide about 90 miles of cold water fish habitat. Primary game fish are bass, crappies and several trout species. Fishing and hunting are the most significant recreational activities. There are 175 miles of streams as well as numerous springs and reservoirs that provide more than 1,000 acres of riparian habitat.

## The Program

### The Decision

The program that will be implemented consists of the following major actions:

Does not include forage in enclosures, recreation and administrative sites, and areas presently inaccessible to livestock use.

1) The initial allocation<sup>1</sup> of livestock forage as follows:

Livestock	51,179 AUMs
Wildlife	2,449 AUMs

2) The implementation of grazing systems and/or significant management changes on 88 intensive management allotments.

3) The completion of range improvements at an approximate cost of \$525,000 to the government on the intensive management allotments.

4) The continuation of non-intensive management on 169 allotments.

5) The monitoring and evaluation of resource uses and changes in condition caused by implementation of this decision.

## Consideration of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Policy Goals

Only the Proposed Action and the Limit Downward Adjustments alternative, of those alternatives addressed in the Ironside EIS, are consistent with all six policy goals of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

These policy goals are set forth in Sec. 101(b) of NEPA:

"In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the

Federal Government to use all practicable means? consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may:

(1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations:

generations:

(2) assure for all Americans a safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;

(3) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;

(4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;

(5) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

(6) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources."

The program to be implemented is primarily a blend of the Proposed Action and the Limit Downward Adjustments with some specific modifications resulting from public comments received during the planning/EIS/RPS process, incorporation of new resource data, and implementation of new policies and regulations since completion of the Ironside EIS. Inclusion of these changes will reduce adverse social and economic impacts, while maintaining the beneficial aspects of the Ironside EIS Proposed Action. As revised, the program is the environmentally preferred alternative and is consistent with all six NEPA goals.

## What The Program Is

The major program actions were designed

to meet objectives of several of BLM's resource management responsibilities. This section includes a detailed description of the major actions and their relationship to these diverse program objectives. Implementation of this program and accomplishment of many of its objectives is dependent on future appropriation of funds.

## 1. Grazing Management

This program will allocate 51,179 AUMs of forage for livestock and 2,449 AUMs of livestock forage for deer and elk. This allocation represents a net increase of 602 AUMs from the 1978 authorized active use for livestock. Forage allocations for each allotment are shown in Appendix I. As a result of recent changes in the Federal Grazing Regulations (43 CFR Part 4100), the grazing adjustments greater than 15 percent included in this program may be phased in over a period of 5 years rather than 3 years as outlined in the Ironside EIS Proposed Action. This change has been adopted to be responsive to the large number of comments expressing concern for the adverse economic impacts of the Ironside EIS Proposed Action.

Eighty-eight allotments covering 321,875 acres of public lands supporting 43,957 AUMs of livestock are scheduled for intensive management. Allotment management agreements have been developed for most of the intensive management allotments. Proposed grazing systems are summarized below and detailed by allotment in Appendix II. The range improvements included as part of this program are outlined in Appendix III.

Due to the collection of new data which does not support the degree of livestock reduction identified in the EIS and draft RPS, the approach

for reaching the resource management objectives has been modified. The modified approach calls for significant change from current management methods with the primary goal of improving distribution of livestock within each allotment where resource conditions are unsatisfactory. Other management actions will be used to more intensively manage livestock grazing and include: changing class of livestock, herding, salting, changing seasons of use and using crested wheatgrass seedings to reduce grazing pressure on native ranges. Range studies show that improvement and positive trends are occurring over most of the public land acreage since the use reduction and emphasis on improved management in the last 20-30 years. There are, however, some areas within several allotments that have not satisfactorily responded. These areas are primarily riparian zones and canyon bottoms. Permittees in these allotments have committed themselves to make significant changes in their operations to improve resource conditions. The Baker District Advisory Council, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Baker County Chamber of Commerce and the Baker County Livestock Association support this approach in order to avoid further reductions in livestock use.

It is recognized that funding for range improvements may be limited but that progress toward the objectives is expected regardless of funding levels. The livestock permittee will have responsibility for cooperating in achieving improvement of resource conditions. Use adjustments will be postponed no more than 3 years for collecting and measuring resource data to determine if the management change is producing favorable results. If not, livestock use will be reduced.

Nonintensive management is scheduled for 169 allotments covering almost 50,000 acres on



numerous scattered tracts of public land supporting 7,222 AUMs.

## 2. Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Management

The following actions are included in the program to maintain or improve aquatic and riparian habitat:

- Fence 9 miles of stream and 9% acres of riparian habitat to exclude livestock grazing. A total of 800 acres of public riparian or up land habitat will be included in these enclosures.

- Maintain 31 wildlife enclosures covering 1,272 acres. This includes protection of Love Reservoir by maintaining the 80 acre enclosure fence which contains about 5 acres of aquatic and riparian habitat.

- Improve or maintain 164 miles of stream and 920 acres of riparian habitat through intensive livestock management. Approximately five percent of this goal may not be achieved when summer grazing occurs in the low elevations where cattle concentrate

### Grazing Systems

Rest Rotation	Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Seasonal	Fenced Exclusions
115,441	9,362	151,200	45,040	832

in canyon bottoms and along water zones.

-Improve about 100 riparian areas adjacent to spring developments by fencing the overflow areas. This will exclude grazing from about 40 acres of riparian habitat.

### **3. Water Resources Management**

Erosion and runoff rates will be decreased by reducing grazing intensity and improving ecosystem condition. It is estimated that after grazing, about 70 percent of the total vegetation produced annually in the area will be available to reduce soil loss and maintain site productivity. In addition, erosion and runoff rates should decrease on 34,700 acres through brush control and reseeding.

Water quality will be maintained or improved on 164 miles of streams, 100 springs, and 1 reservoir as a result of stabilizing and improving riparian vegetation.

### **4. Wildlife Habitat Management**

Elk and deer are allocated 2,449 AUMs of livestock forage which will support the public land percentage of elk and deer numbers identified in the November 1980 proposed "Herd Management Objective" developed in cooperation with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). The Wildlife Commission has the responsibility for final approval of these objectives. The management objectives provide for 19,700 deer and 4,500 elk on the four herd units in the Baker Resource Area. BLM has the responsibility to establish the wildlife forage allocation level on the public lands it manages. Should the final objectives change from the November 1980 proposal, this allocation may be modified accordingly. Following approval of the elk and deer management objectives, monitoring data will serve as the basis for ODFW recommending future population changes.

The forage allocated to wildlife includes only the forage that is competed for by livestock and big game when a range area is stocked to its grazing capacity. This allocation is dependent upon the number of grazing animals, the type of forage available and the similarity in the diet

of the various grazing animals. These AUMs represent the forage that is called dietary overlap. Dietary overlap between deer and cattle is approximately 20-30 percent and 60-80 percent between elk and cattle.

The total competitive and non-competitive AUM consumption on public land by elk and deer in the Baker Resource Area, using the proposed ODFW Herd Management Objective numbers, is approximately 8,050 AUMs.

Forage allocation needs for other wildlife species have not been specified at this time. General wildlife habitat needs are considered in the management of aquatic and riparian areas, by establishing vegetation objectives consistent with habitat needs, by implementing grazing systems which meet these vegetation objectives, and by constructing range improvements that enhance habitat conditions.

The seeding of 14,070 acres and brush control on 20,630 acres will be designed to provide an optimum balance between wildlife cover and forage areas. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife will be consulted to aid in the design of specific land treatments.

### **5. Resource Monitoring and Evaluation**

The following resource studies will be conducted in intensively managed allotments and some of the nonintensively managed allotments to evaluate the effectiveness of the range management program.

#### **a. Livestock**

Livestock use data will be obtained annually from each permittee showing numbers of livestock and dates of use. Livestock counts will be made periodically by the Bureau to verify these records.

#### **b. Vegetation**

Utilization studies will be conducted annually to measure how much vegetation, by key forage species, is removed by grazing animals. Trend studies will be conducted to determine long-term changes in plant species composition in relation to

vegetative objectives. Phenological development dates for key plant species will be gathered annually to be used in designing and reviewing grazing management systems. These studies will be done on both upland and riparian zones

#### **c. Climate**

Climatological data will be gathered annually and evaluated to determine the effects of crop-year precipitation on herbage yields and for correlation with utilization studies.

#### **d. Water Quality and Aquatic Life**

Studies will be conducted to measure water quality and quantity. Low level infrared photography will be used to document changes in aquatic habitat (including riparian vegetation) resulting from implementation of grazing management systems. Water yield will be measured on selected perennial streams to measure



results of the timber management and grazing systems.

#### e. Wildlife

Actual use data for elk and deer will be obtained annually from the ODFW and supplemental BLM studies. Selected important habitat will be monitored to identify wildlife needs and habitat trends and use. Studies will be conducted in exclosures in riparian areas to monitor trend, wildlife use and water yield.

#### f. Sensitive, Threatened and Endangered (T/E) Species

The species being considered for listing by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as either endangered or threatened will be studied to determine the effects of the management program.

### What the Program Does

This program enables BLM to meet the multiple use mandates and agency missions spelled out in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA, 1976), the Public Rangelands Improvement Act (PRIA, 1978) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 1969). The following discussion summarizes the beneficial and adverse effects of the proposed rangeland management program.

#### 1. Livestock Forage

The planned level of grazing use combined with grazing systems and range improvements will maintain or improve ecosite condition. Over a 15-year period, available livestock forage is expected to increase due to vegetative manipulation, natural improvement due to improved management efforts and increased forage availability resulting from management efforts to improve distribution of livestock use. The average stocking rate on public lands presently is 7.27 acres per AUM. The goal is to improve it to an average of 6.8 acres per AUM which would increase livestock forage from the present 51,179 AUMs to 54,682 AUMs. A short-term loss of forage production will occur on 40,400 acres

proposed for seeding and brush control.

#### 2. Soils and Water

Increased perennial plant cover resulting from the planned livestock management and Band treatments will protect soils from both wind and water erosion. In the long term, the increase in perennial cover is expected to reduce runoff by 1,150 acre-feet annually. While stabilizing streambanks and decreasing soil loss by 43 acre-feet per year.

#### 3. Aquatic and Riparian Habitat

Water developments and fences are expected to result in more even distribution of livestock. With fewer animals around perennial streams, water quality is expected to improve.

Over hundred and seventy-five miles of streams, more than 100 spring overflows, and 15 reservoirs will be managed and/or fenced to decrease livestock concentrations and fecal coliform bacteria. Riparian habitat will be maintained or improved on about 95 percent of the total riparian area. The 15 reservoirs planned would increase the amount of aquatic and riparian habitat in the area.

Adverse impacts now caused by livestock grazing may continue on approximately 8 miles of stream and 46 acres of riparian zone. However, none of these streams are considered crucial for fish, and the costs of fencing or other methods of protection were deemed prohibitive compared to the benefits. The 8 miles of stream will be under intensive grazing systems such as rest rotation or deferred rotation, but may be adversely affected to some degree by livestock grazing.

#### 4. Wildlife

The vegetation allocation will assure a dependable supply of forage for big game on public land. Consistent with land use plan objectives, a portion of the increased forage, expected in the long term, will be allocated to big game should the ODFW Herd Management Objectives increase.



The 15 reservoir developments will significantly improve the habitat for more than 100 bird species as well as numerous terrestrial animals which require riparian habitat.

The grazing systems planned in deer and elk winter ranges will help insure adequate quantities of quality forage. These systems will benefit about 15,000 deer and 1,500 elk on 250,000 acres of important winter range.

Vegetation manipulation, consisting of 14,070 acres of seedings and 20,630 acres of brush control using fire, chemical sprays, or mechanical treatments, will add diversity and improve forage areas for most big game and non-game species. However, some species, such as the sage sparrow and the sagebrush lizard, which are dependent upon sagebrush, will probably be displaced from treatment areas.

Wildlife species differ markedly in their habitat requirements. This program will help provide a variety of vegetative successional stages and a corresponding variety of habitats for the widest number of species.



## 5. Socio-Economic Conditions

The Baker County economic study completed in 1981 by Oregon State University, provides a basis for evaluating local economic impacts due to changes in public land management. It was used to estimate local economic impacts in the Ironside EIS and this RPS.

Short term changes in the Baker County economy will result primarily from the adjustments in grazing use and government expenditures on range improvements. These actions are expected to change net sales and property values of the dependent ranches, local personal income and county economic activity.

The Final RPS decision includes reductions of 1,786 AUMs on 16 allotments and increases of 2,388 AUMs on 28 allotments; for a net increase of 602 AUMs.

In 1979, the dependent ranchers' total annual economic activity in Baker County was approximately \$12,300,000 or 2.6 percent of the county's total economic activity. Based upon the 602 AUM increase in grazing use and attendant hay purchases, total economic activity in the county would increase by 0.03 percent or \$165,000 and increase short-term net local personal income would increase by about \$5,000 annually.

The expenditure of approximately \$525,000 over a period of five years on range improvements is expected to annually increase local personal income by \$42,000 and local economic activity by \$230,000.

At initial implementation, the net local personal income effect considering grazing adjustments (sales of animals minus increased hay purchases), net costs for herd adjustments (first year only), and installation of range improvements, would be increased by \$66,000 in the first year, an average of \$110,000 from the second to the fifth year and \$5,000 immediately afterward.

For purposes of loan collateral or ranch valuation in the real estate market, de facto increases of \$39,000 may occur in the short term.

in the long term, new water developments will result in livestock traveling a shorter distance from feed to water and improve utilization patterns. Vegetation changes and improved management will lead to increased quantity and quality of forage.

Although some ranchers will experience a short-term negative economic impact from initial grazing reductions, long-term impacts may be beneficial. Within 15 years 3,503 additional AUMs should be available for livestock. This is 4,105 AUMs more than present active preference.

Assuming permittees can develop hay production on their ranch to accommodate the herd size increase, there would be a \$145,000 increase in net sales, compared to 1978 grazing level based on Table 73 of the Baker County Economic Study.

Local personal income would increase over 1979 levels by \$70,000 (\$30,000 to permittee and their employees and \$40,000 to other local businesses and their employees). Total economic activity (sales) by Baker County businesses would increase by \$395,080. For purposes of loan collateral, or ranch valuation in the real estate market, de facto increases of \$270,000 may occur in the long term.

## Alternatives

The Ironside EIS analyzed the environmental impacts of a proposed rangeland management program and the following five alternative actions. Portions of these alternatives are included in the adopted rangeland program.

The Proposed Action, the Limit Downward Adjustments, the Optimize Livestock Grazing and the Optimize Wildlife, Wild Horses, and Nonconsumptive Uses alternatives were derived from the EIS scoping process and the land use plans developed for the Ironside EIS area.

The No Action alternative is required by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations and the Eliminate Livestock Grazing alternative was included for comparative purposes as a matter of BLM policy

## No Action

This alternative provides for authorized livestock use to continue at 50,594 AUMs annually. There would be no specific forage allocation for wildlife.

No new allotment management plans would be developed. Present stocking rates and seasons of use would continue. Existing range improvement projects would be maintained, but no new developments would be constructed.

This alternative was not adopted because forage plants on fair and poor condition ranges would remain low in vigor and there would be little or no improvement in rangeland condition. Riparian vegetation would continue to deteriorate. Competition between livestock and wildlife would continue on some winter ranges.

## Eliminate Livestock Grazing

This alternative would eliminate livestock grazing on all BLM managed public lands in the Ironside area. While existing range improvements would be left in place, only those benefiting other resources would be maintained. No range improvements would be constructed.

This alternative was not adopted except in one allotment because such action is not in harmony with the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act and would not enhance multiple use of the public lands as mandated by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

## Limit Downward Adjustments

This alternative is the same as the proposed action except for those allotments where the downward adjustment exceeds 20 percent of the present active livestock use. Reductions would be phased in over a 5 year period. The initial reduction or increase in the first year would not be more than either 20 percent or one-third of the livestock adjustment included in the proposed action. Range studies would then be initiated to monitor actual use, forage utilization and trend to determine what adjustments of use are needed in the 3rd and 5th years of implementation. Grazing systems and range im-





provements would be implemented during the 5-year period. The scheduled incremental reductions would not be made if resource objectives are being met.

Economic impacts would be reduced by providing a longer phase-in period to reach the adjustment needed to balance livestock use with forage supply. Data from the monitoring studies would indicate the action that would be required to meet resource management objectives. Accepting this alternative may cause a 2-year delay in reaching the program objectives.

The five-year phase-in of this alternative was accepted and made a part of the selected program. The phase-in procedure was modified and published as Bureau policy in the Federal Register on January 19, 1981.

### **Optimize Livestock Grazing**

This alternative would initially allocate all available forage (53,628 AUMs) to livestock. This amount is 2,449 AUMs more for livestock than the

selected program. There would be no allocation of competitive forage for big game. Riparian areas would be protected only to the extent needed to meet Federal and State water quality standards. Wildlife enclosure would be grazed one out of every three years. Sheep grazing would be encouraged on steep slopes.

Livestock grazing would have preference over the other resource values. Most Management Framework Plan objectives or constraints which give priority to non-livestock uses would not apply. All other aspects of the selected program, including range **improvement** projects and grazing systems, would apply by implementing this alternative.

This alternative was not selected because of the adverse consequences the additional land treatments would have on deer winter range areas and other wildlife habitat. This alternative does not allocate livestock forage to wildlife. About 2,500 AUMs of livestock forage would continue to be consumed by wildlife, leading to potential overgrazing in wildlife concentration areas. Impacts on riparian areas and on erosion would be greater than at the present time.

### **Optimize Wildlife, Wild Horses, and Nonconsumptive Uses**

Under this alternative the allocation of forage would favor wildlife and nonconsumptive uses. There would be 11,358 AUMs less forage for livestock than the proposed action. The allocation under this alternative would be achieved by excluding livestock from all riparian areas, by allocating to wildlife the forage required to support the highest historic big game populations and by limiting total grazing use by all animals to 40 percent of the annual production of the key species.

This alternative would allocate forage in excess of current wildlife needs. The present population of elk and deer are near the proposed "Herd Management Objective" numbers. Deer populations are presently lower than the historic peak but elk numbers are near historic peak. However, allocation of forage would not exceed

the need of elk and deer objectives that eventually will be established.

Limiting total forage use to 40 percent of the key species will generally hasten range and riparian area improvement. Although this alternative is environmentally sound and would benefit most resource conditions, it is not accepted as the adopted program because of the resulting negative economic and social impacts. In addition, wildlife objectives can basically be achieved by allocating forage to meet the need of the "Herd Management Objective" numbers of big game. Also, by implementing grazing systems, making use adjustments and developing range improvement projects, a balanced multiple use program can be achieved without the adverse economic and social impacts associated with a program weighted heavily to wildlife and nonconsumptive uses.

## **Relationship Of This Rangeland Management Program To The Ironside EIS Proposed Action and Alternatives**

### **Intensity of Management**

The Ironside EIS proposed action listed 137 allotments for intensive management. This rangeland management program will implement intensive management on 88 allotments. The change of 49 allotments to nonintensive management is based on the following:

- 1 Most of the allotments that have been taken from the intensive category are those where the publicland acreage is small and borders larger blocks of public land. It was the original intent to place these tracts under intensive management. It has since been determined that the range improvements needed to shift these areas to intensive management would not be practical or economical.
2. A few allotments proposed for intensive management are either fenced in with or

border large blocks of land administered by the U.S. Forest Service property. The management of these tracts will depend on upcoming planning by the U. S. Forest Service. Most of these tracts may be transferred to the Forest Service or disposed of by other means at a later date.

3. A cost/benefit analysis indicates that the funding necessary to intensively manage such small tracts of public lands is not justified.

## Management Systems

The Ironside EIS proposed action included tentative grazing systems developed to achieve a specific management objective. Without changing these objectives, different grazing systems and other changes in management have been developed for several allotments which will take into account factors such as differences in elevation and climate. These changes may be seen by comparing Table 1-6 of the Ironside EIS with Appendix II of this document.

The Ironside EIS proposed a variety of grazing systems and forage utilization objectives. This document has been modified so that on both deferred rotation and rest rotation grazing systems on a native range a 60 percent utilization limit will be used and 65 percent on the wheatgrass seedings. On rotation or spring/fall systems utilization will be 50 percent of annual forage production. A 40 percent utilization will be used for allotments where continuous spring, spring/summer and season long grazing is proposed. The use objectives are designed to fit the benefits of the various grazing systems while still maintaining and improving the vigor of the key species.

## Range Improvement

The overall size of the range improvement program and the government's share of the total cost has been substantially reduced as a result of cost/benefit analysis, refinement of individual

## Range Improvement Program Comparison

	Seeding (acres)	Brush Control (acres)	Fence (miles)	Springs (No.)	Reservoirs (No.)	Buzzlers (No.)	Pipeline (miles)
EIS	19,030	21,580	100.5	95	13	11	38.8
Final RPS	14,070	20,630	63.5	92	15	1	40.5

project plans. consultation with permittees and increased permittee participation in the construction of the projects. The above table provides a comparison between the EIS Proposed Action alternative and the final RPS decision.

## Forage Production

In all but five of the allotments forage inventories of the 1950s and 1960s were used to obtain production estimates for the EIS. Because of their age, these inventories were not suitable for establishing new stocking rates. Range studies collected since 1978 together with a review of existing trend studies and old photographs indicate that an upward trend has resulted on most of the public lands. On-the-ground observations, however, support the opinion that resource conditions must be improved on select and specific sites, primarily the low elevation lands which include some riparian zones and canyon bottoms that are grazed each year in the heat of the summer. Consequently, annual monitoring studies will provide the direction as to when, how much and what corrective actions are needed to balance grazing use with site capability.

## Public Involvement

### Planning

District personnel made periodic formal and informal contacts during the planning process with representatives of many agencies and organizations. During the period from 1976-1978, nearly 100 contacts were made with users, interest groups, government agencies, etc. to acquire specific resource information.

The Oregon A-95 Clearinghouse was notified and returned comments on April 27, 1979.

On June 6, 1979, an open house was held in Baker to solicit comments and suggestions on the multiple use analysis and alternative decision. Since only 9 people attended, a letter outlining the time schedule for the land use plan and Ironside EIS, as well as a listing of major issues, was sent to all grazing permittees asking for further input. A limited response was received.

On August 15, BLM held an evening meeting to discuss the proposed MFP decisions. One hundred twenty people attended. Because of the level of public interest, another evening session was held on August 23, 1979, with 70 persons in attendance.

One of the major issues in the Baker District during the Planning/EIS process was related to the application of BLM's Suitability Standards and the subsequent livestock grazing use reductions. In early September, Baker County Livestock Association organized a Suitability Committee. On September 6, 1979, the committee met with the Chief of the BLMs Division of Range Management as well as personnel from the Oregon State Office and Baker District Office.

The Baker District held field tours with the committee on September 25, October 11 and 29 and November 5, 1979, to view firsthand some areas of concern. The Oregon State Director, the Chief of Resources and the Baker District Manager met with the committee on November 2, 1979, to further discuss issues. On November 13, 1979, District representatives met with the committee to review the observations made on the four field tours.

On June 28, 1980, the State Director and District Manager met with the Baker County Joint Economic Impact Study Committee and the Baker County Livestock Association Suitability Committee.

The first draft of the Baker County Economic Study was released on October 23, 1980. The second draft was released on November 4, 1980. The release of the final study was made in early March 1981. The group presented the second draft to the Baker District Advisory Council on January 21, 1981.

Following the charter of the Baker District Advisory Council in June 1980, the group met on September 16, held field tours on October 16 and 24, 1980, and met on January 21, 1981. The purpose for these meetings was to discuss land use planning and environmental assessment issues on the public lands in Baker County.

## **Draft EIS**

One hundred twenty persons attended an evening meeting on August 15, 1979, in Baker, to determine which issues should be considered for discussion in the Ironside EIS and to design realistic alternatives to the proposed action. The Limit Downward Adjustments Alternative was a result of public input received at this meeting.

On February 21, 1980, Dr. Kerry Gee, Colorado State University Agricultural Economist under BLM contract, met with ranchers from Baker County to gather economic data relating to ranch budgets. Ranchers voted not to participate in Dr. Gee's study and chose to organize the Baker Economic Study Committee. The Baker County Joint Economic Impact Study completed by Oregon State University was a product of this effort.

April 28, 1980: The Draft Ironside Grazing Management EIS (Interior DEIS 80-26) was filed with the Environmental Protection Agency and released to the public on April 28, 1980. The 60-day comment period ended on June 27, 1980.

June 3-4, 1980: Public hearings on the draft were held in Ontario, Oregon, and Baker, Oregon, respectively. Oral testimony was received from eight people in Ontario and 18 in Baker. A total of 26 letters were received.

## **Final EIS**

September 22, 1980: The Final Ironside Grazing Management EIS was filed with the Environmental Protection Agency and made available to the public. Five comment letters were submitted for consideration in the final land use decisions.

Aside from comments received concerning the quality of the EIS analysis, the majority of the comments expressed concerns about the adverse economic impacts to be caused by the proposed action. Many comments were also received concerning the management of riparian and other important wildlife habitat areas. In addition several comments pointed out that study data gathered since 1978 had not been considered in the EIS.

All the comments received were considered prior to drafting this rangeland management program. These comments were incorporated in the following ways where consistent with policy and resource objectives:

- a. Major grazing use adjustments will be phased-in over a five-year period rather than three years. This action will provide a longer period for adjusting operations and will provide additional time to evaluate monitoring studies data and to allow time for management actions to be completed.
- b. Riparian area management has been reviewed to include an optimum acreage within practical management systems and feasible exclusion areas.
- c. Study data collected since 1978 have been evaluated from a number of allotments where the EIS showed significant adjustments were necessary. Where the new data did not support the need for grazing adjust-

ments, the adjustments were scaled back to reflect the new data.

- d. The application of BLM's suitability standards was reviewed. As a result of this review, a number of the grazing reductions proposed in the EIS have been adjusted to be consistent with the re-evaluation of the standards.

## **Draft RPS**

On March 13, 1981, the Draft Ironside Rangeland Program Summary Record of Decision was released for public review and comment. A public meeting was held on March 25, 1981, in Baker to receive public comment. The comment period on the draft RPS continued until April 1981. The draft RPS was reviewed with Oregon's Congressional Delegation, several national organizations, and BLM's Washington Office staff on March 31, 1981. Eight comments were received and answered.

Consultation meetings took place from April 1981 through release of the Final RPS in November 1981 with those permittees receiving proposed adjustments. Consultations also took place with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Baker District Advisory Council. Consultation with the general public occurred through an Advisory Council field tour on August 19, 1981, a public meeting on September 15, 1981, and an Advisory Council meeting which included input from Baker County Livestock Association on September 16, 1981. The public comments and input from the consultation efforts are an integral part of the final rangeland program decision presented in this document.

## **Implementation**

### **Administrative Actions**

Release of the Ironside Rangeland Program Summary and Record of Decision to interested groups and individuals will serve as public notice of the range management program for the Baker Resource Area of the Baker District. From the date of release of this RPS, a 30-day public review

period is provided. Following this period a "Notice of Proposed Decision" will be issued to each permittee identifying management objectives, management actions to be undertaken, forage use allocations and monitoring responsibilities. Anyone else who has indicated in writing that their interest may be affected by the rangeland program in any allotment also will be issued a copy of the "Notice of Proposed Decision" for the allotment of their stated concern.

The "Notice of Proposed Decision" may be protested or appealed under provisions of the grazing regulations (43 CFR 41 fX.2 and 4160.4). Except where appeals are filed, these decisions will become effective March 1, 1982, for the 19132 grazing year.

## **Implementation and Budget Appropriations**

This RPS recognizes the commitment from the Baker Chamber of Commerce, the Baker Live-

stock Association and individual permittees that in lieu of suffering the degree of reductions in livestock use identified in the Ironside EIS and the draft RPS that a concentrated effort toward modifying current allotment management practices must be made to accomplish the same resource goals as use reductions would.

Achieving the vegetation objectives in the Baker Resource Area is heavily dependent upon improving the distribution of livestock use within the allotments. An important factor in achieving this goal is permittee supervision of their livestock by proper distribution of livestock upon entering an allotment, followed by constant and regular riding, and salting efforts. Change in season of use and class of livestock as well as improving distribution of livestock use in the mountainous terrain common to Baker County public lands are primary practices that will be employed, together with grazing systems to maintain and improve resource conditions.

The construction of range improvements supplements the permittee's efforts in meeting the vegetation objectives. Funding for new improvements is dependent on congressional and executive action. There is no guarantee that funds adequate to construct the projects identified in this RPS will be available. Appendix III lists range improvements that could be constructed and the approximate costs of construction. In many allotments improved grazing management can be implemented immediately. In others, the new range improvements are necessary before total implementation of improved grazing systems is possible. Construction priorities will be based on the following criteria.

1. Analysis of costs and benefits.
2. Opportunities to improve unsatisfactory resource conditions.
3. Environmental or other resource considerations.
4. Opportunities to stabilize the livestock community, including individual operations.

Construction of planned rangeland facilities will begin in fiscal year 1982 as funds become available. Contributions from permittees of labor,

materials or money are encouraged and may determine if specific range improvements can be constructed.

## **Grazing Use Adjustments and Monitoring**

To assure that progress will be made toward reaching the management objectives for each allotment, monitoring evaluations will be made. The initial adjustments and/or management actions specified in the "Notice of Proposed Decisions" have been determined sufficient to achieve significant progress toward the vegetation objectives set forth for the Baker Resource Area. However, if the authorized officer of the Bureau determines that the monitoring data indicates that the amount of the scheduled adjustments and management action should be modified, a new decision shall be issued in accordance with 43 CFR 4160. Deviations from the final decisions must be based on additional monitoring data of at least equal quality to that on which the decision was based.

## **Periodic Progress Reports**

As this rangeland management program is implemented, a record of progress will be maintained and the specific program details will be contained in periodic updates of this RPS. These publications will contain a summary of livestock grazing decisions, monitoring results, range improvement progress, improvement efforts made by permittees and management system information. This record of progress will be distributed periodically in late fall or winter for public information and comment.



## FORAGE ALLOCATION

Allotment Number and Name	Public Land (acres)	Other Land (acres)	Manage- ment Type	Wildlife Forage (AUMs)	Livestock Use (AUMs)	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Adjustment From Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)
1001 Snake R.-Sisley Cr.	23,027	2,790	I	296	4,693	4,693	0
1002 Iron Mountain	4,809	157	I	12	867	767	+100
1003 Cave Creek	4,873	1258	I	79	541	795	-254
1004 Durkee	9,154	1,392	I	75	1,027	1,027	0
1005 Woods Gulch	268	325	N	0	28	28	0
1006 Huntington	9,790	3,660	I	170	1,980	1,980	0
1007 School Section	606	0	N	0	63	63	0
1008 Lime Plant	364	1,888	N	0	48	48	0
1009 Slaughterhouse Mtn.	797	190	I	11	110	110	0
1010 West Highway	253	1,580	N	0	30	30	0
1011 South Durbin Cr.	775	40	N	0	168	168	0
1012 Cavanaugh Cr.	118	4,235	N	0	16	16	0
1013 Benson Cr.	3,359	186	I	0	858	858	0
1014 Freeway	533	302	I	0	122	122	0
1015 East Table Mtn.	1,240	661	I	8	229	279	-50
1016 Table Mtn.	7,678	1,255	I	0	2,212	2,212	0
1017 Burned	1,254	53	I	0	343	343	0
1018 Upper Durbin Cr.	1,004	346	I	0	197	197	0
1019 Marshall Cr.	194	1,757	N	0	23	23	0
1020 Dixie Cr.	2,933	1,243	I	40	404	404	0
1021 Pedro Mtn.	2,700	8,789	I	55	552	552	0
1022 Bowman Flat	245	122	N	0	65	65	0
1023 Rattlesnake Gulch	402	309	I	25	92	92	0
1024 Upper Shirttail Cr.	501	243	N	8	111	111	0
1025 Baldy Mtn.	80	472	N	0	10	10	0
1026 North Dixie Cr.	980	2,150	I	10	195	195	0
1027 Lost Basin	1,337	6,730	N	0	283	283	0
1028 Upper Cave Cr.	105	720	N	0	27	27	0
1029 True Blue Gulch	62	2,211	N	0	14	14	0
1030 Hollowfield Canyon	301	385	N	0	42	42	0
1031 Shirttail Cr.	806	901	I	0	152	152	0
1032 French Cr.	954	1,135	N	0	143	143	0
1033 Fur Mtn.	399	1,661	N	0	48	48	0
1034 Clough Gulch	18	259	N	0	2	2	0
1035 Upper Clough Gulch	95	535	N	0	35	35	0
1036 Weatherby Mtn.	210	1,799	N	0	28	28	0
1037 Rye Valley	2,740	120	I	0	668	668	0
1038 Beaver Cr.	341	694	N	0	47	47	0
1039 Turner Gulch	3,746	444	I	19	484	484	0
1040 Little Valley	3,199	1,595	I	0	695	695	0
1041 Cinder Butte	1,540	1,617	I	0	245	245	0
1043 Whiskey Gulch	80	479	N	0	27	27	0
1044 Juniper Mtn.	2,072	260	I	8	318	318	0
1045 Jordon Cr.	607	60	N	0	91	91	0
1046 Durkee Timber	859	1,513	N	0	122	122	0
1048 Nodine Cr.	3,054	6,149	I	10	684	684	0
1049 Lower Manning Cr.	479	3,219	N	0	40	40	0
1050 North Swayze Cr.	320	40	N	0	24	24	0
1051 Alder Cr.	141	371	N	0	13	13	0
1052 Trail Cr.	885	3,308	N	0	107	107	0
1053 Spring Gulch	38	145	N	0	7	7	0
1054 Pipeline	110	153	N	0	12	12	0
1055 North Manning Cr.	509	505	N	0	50	50	0

## FORAGE ALLOCATION

Allotment Number and Name	Public Land (acres)	Other Land ( a c r e s )	Manage- ment Type	Wildlife Forage (AUMs)	Livestock Use (AUMs)	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Adjustment From Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)
1056 Horseshoe	204	81	N	0			0
1057 Hibbard Cr.	160	240	N	0	24	24	0
1058 Plano School	40	250	N				0
1062 Powell Cr.	630	3,240	N		39	39	0
1063 Bayhorse	242	1,330	N	0	36	36	0
1064 Gold Cr.	370	4,051	N		41	41	0
1065 Pearce Gulch	63	568	N			6	0
1066 Farewell Bend	738	300	I	0	162	162	0
1067 Tunnell	21	1,268	N		4	4	0
1301 South Bridgeport	18,705	2,150	I	226	2,860	2,726	+134
1302 North Bridgeport	10,914	4,515	I	0	724	944	-220
1318 Mormon Basin	9,734	2,825	I	0	1,298	1,298	0
1320 Mill Gulch	1,243	536	I		98	98	0
1326 Brinker Cr.	20	503	N	0			0
1327 Meyer Gulch	167	2,351	N	0	15	15	0
1329 Pine Cr.	520	0	N		60	60	0
1330 Juniper Hill	217	2,024	N		17	17	0
1333 Marble Cr.	84	1,118	N	0	14	14	0
2002 Sunnyslope	492	2,092	N		51	51	0
2003 Powder River	210	0	N		18	35	-17
2004 Five Mile	1,373	49	I	5	150	150	0
2005 Second Creek	3,131	46	I		450	408	-42
2006 Crystal Palace	103	0	N			6	0
2007 Sardine Cr.	613	2,326	N	0	104	104	0
2008 River Individual	339	1,990	N	10	66	66	0
2010 Bone Gulch	201	914	N				0
2011 Beagle Cr.	110	745	N	0			0
2012 Big Cr.	3,072	233	I	25	282	282	0
2013 Highway #203	120	810	N		4	4	0
2015 Maggie Peak	2,120	520	S		428	357	+71
2017 West Maggie Peak	760	1,192	N		123	123	0
2019 Salt Cr.	2,076	2,446	I		343	265	+78
2020 Crews Cr.	2,996	960	I		420	573	-153
2021 Seeding	400	0	I	5	150	79	+71
2022 Ridley Cr.	78	16	N	0	10	10	0
2023 Upper Pittsburg	350	7	I	13	36	36	0
2024 Table Rock	2,117	40	I	73	286	336	-50
2025 Upper Spring Cr.	555	0	I		80	135	-55
2026 East Spring Cr.	99	345	N		15	30	-75
2027 West Balm Cr.	175	10	N	0	26	25	+1
2028 Sawmill Cr.	180	0	N		35	27	+8
2030 Lower Powder	556	40	N		78	78	0
2031 Bulldozer	4,006	367	I	ii	1,330	1001	+329
2032 Goose Cr.	3,873	548	I	0	387	477	-90
2033 Lower Salt Cr.	262	392	N		26	26	0
2034 Love Cr.	1,794	88	I	0	180	180	0
2035 Waterspout	1,885	63	I	0	605	605	0
2036 Table Mtn.	600	0	I		52	52	0
2037 Balm Cr.	3,945	40	I	76	262	250	+12
2038 West Goose Cr.	155	10	N	0	4	4	0
2040 Spring Cr.	1,432	0	I	29	83	17	+66
2041 Cottonwood Cr.	280	342	I		40	14	+26
2042 Lower Houghton Cr.	319	0	N	0	115	60	-55

**FORAGE ALLOCATION**

Allotment Number and Name		Public Land (acres)	Other Land (acres)	Manage- <sup>1</sup> ment Type	Wildlife Forage (AUMs)	Livestock Use (AUMs)	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Adjustment From Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)
2043	Langrell Gulch	238	1,644	N	0	4	4	0
2046	Upper Glover Cr.	847	389	I	46	107	107	0
2050	Upper Ritter Cr.	2,668	3,484	I	0	500	500	0
2051	Gale Place	62	727	N	0	11	11	0
2055	Clover Cr.	1,061	1,940	I	6	105	82	-23
2060	Farley Hills	440	2,921	N	0	42	40	+2
2062	Maggie Peak	84	3,216	N	0	9	17	-8
2063	Upper Crews Cr.	200	2,597	N	0	16	16	0
2064	North Sparta	24	0	N	0	2	2	0
2065	Town Gulch	23	496	N	0	2	2	0
2066	Baldock	39	786	N	0	5	8	-3
2067	Ranch Cr	262	820	N	0	36	36	0
2068	Rosebud Mine	180	1,624	N	0	6	5	+1
2069	Lone Pine Mtn.	296	3,027	N	0	30	30	0
2070	Summit Pasture	1,237	427	I	0	110	92	+18
2071	McCann Springs	1,787	0	I	0	450	361	+89
2073	Oregon Trail	380	1,644	N	0	25	25	0
2074	Pritchard Cr.	13,562	1,351	I	35	2,198	2,383	-185
2075	Unity Cr.	570	1,415	N	0	87	87	0
2076	Pritchard Flat	446	6,445	N	0	47	40	+7
2077	Ritter Cr.	770	392	I	0	154	133	+21
2078	North Flagstaff	1,802	62	I	0	232	142	+90
2081	Upper Houghton Cr.	340	42	N	0	85	36	+49
2083	Big Rattlesnake	178	1,347	N	1	16	20	-4
2084	Powder River Canyon	1,207	178	I	0	100	100	0
2085	West Clover Cr.	545	140	I	0	156	95	+61
2086	White Swan Mine	475	180	N	0	65	65	0
2087	First Cr.	586	3,905	N	0	66	51	+15
2092	Canyon Cr.	200	2,500	N	0	8	8	0
2094	North Bacher Cr.	135	0	N	0	33	33	0
2095	Homesite	80	309	N	0	11	11	0
2096	Virtue Flat	290	2,683	N	0	40	40	0
2097	Dry Gulch	40	850	N	0	6	6	0
2099	Virtue Hills	4,210	3,725	I	0	450	484	-34
2100	Encina	40	550	N	0	2	2	0
2101	Quartz Cr.	40	1,013	N	0	4	4	0
2102	North Sardine Cr.	185	316	N	0	19	19	0
2103	Lawrence Cr	50	796	N	0	9	9	0
2104	Interchange	250	691	N	0	16	16	0
2105	Love Pasture	1,275	23	I	0	317	262	+65
2106	Christy Springs	200	525	N	0	31	31	0
2108	Keating Highway	4,386	35	I	0	500	396	+104
2109	Ruckles Cr.	5,903	649	I	0	900	410	+490
2111	Bacher Cr.	831	1,278	I	0	116	87	+29
2112	Maiden Gulch	1,043	2,196	N	21	99	99	0
2114	Little Lookout	890	10,740	N	0	68	68	0
2115	Tucker Cr.	1,475	728	I	0	260	293	-33
2116	East Balm Cr.	1,103	6	I	0	192	120	+72
2118	Fruit Springs	456	1,260	N	0	30	30	0
2120	Pleasant Valley	188	1,282	N	0	28	18	+10
2121	East Pleasant Valley	375	106	I	0	88	88	0
2127	Kelly Cr	1,716	10	I	0	220	264	-44
2128	Risley Butte	2,501	561	I	0	430	330	+100



## FORAGE ALLOCATION

Allotment Number and Name	Public Land (acres)	Other Land (acres)	Manage- ment Type	Wildlife Forage (AUMs)	Livestock Use (AUMs)	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Adjustment From Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)
2129 Chalk Bluff	645	22	I	0	90	63	+27
2130 Lyle Cr.	354	7,180	N	0	29	21	+8
2132 Kuykendahl Cr.	40	1,000	N	0	4	4	0
2139 West Crews	80	594	N	0	13	6	+7
2142 North Ridley Cr.	40	302	N	0	4	4	0
3001 Pine Valley	25,485	10,192	I	338	2,555	2,555	0
3002 Immigrant Gulch	7,079		I	68	598	598	0
3003 Ruth Gulch	8,447	990	I	156	1,266	1,266	0
3004 Doyle Gulch	1,817	312	I	14	140	183	-43
3005 Hunsaker Cr.	6,495	646	I	112	82	340	-258
3006 Homestead	5,122	1,715	I	85	505	560	-55
3007 Copperfield	2,875	955	I	16	106	106	0
3008 Bear Wallow	720	128	N	0	68	68	0
3009 Hooker Flat	533	15	N	0	46	46	0
3010 Dry Creek	40	212	N	0	6	6	0
3011 Park	330	650	N	0	21	21	0
3012 Squaw Creek	4,809	742	I	0	528	528	0
3014 Timber Canyon	5,303	256	I	0	528	528	0
3015 Daly Creek	1,610	1,871	N	10	224	224	0
3016 Burnside	419	4,655	N	0	42	42	0
3017 Sheep Mountain	131	7,581	N	0	22	22	0
3018 Road Gulch	1,959		I	19	168	168	0
3019 Deer Gulch	30		N	0	2	2	0
3021 Crow Reservoir	1,128	4,170	N	0	82	82	0
3022 Foster Gulch	1,679	2,724	I	22	184	194	-10
3024 Horseshoe	118	252	N	0	10	10	0
3025 Maiden Gulch	328	996	N	0	22	22	0
3026 Soda Creek	9,289	8,737	S	132	1,278	1,278	0
3027 Canyon Creek	40	687	N	0	3	3	0
3028 Keystone Mine	291		N	0	24	24	0
3029 Dry Gulch	2,516	3,389	I	15	218	218	0
3030 Lower Timber Canyon	270	848	N	0	14	14	0
3032 Four Mile	40	0	N	0	3	3	0
3037 Daly Creek Indiv.	684	6,121	N	0	96	96	0
3041 West Fork	40	50	N	0	5	5	0
3043 Longbranch	45	693	N	0	5	5	0
3045 McLain Gulch	146	1,707	N	0	14	14	0
3047 New Bridge	136	0	N	0	7	7	0
3048 Sag Creek	40		N	0	5	5	0
3049 Barnard Creek	1,998	1,007	I	0	99	99	0
5001 Coyote Point	400	2,210	N	0	16	16	0
5014 Hunt Mountain	2,609	0	E	0	0	185	-185
5080 Thief Valley	180		N	0	11	11	0
5133 Riverdale Hill	125		N	0	29	29	0
5137 Reservoir	144	1,100	N	0	10	10	0
5138 Bulger Flat	40		N	0	5	5	0
5201 Brannon Gulch	3,247	3,443	I	12	170	170	0
5202 Brown Rocks	1,292	3,826	N	0	72	72	0
5203 Big Creek	80	388	N	0	10	10	0
5204 Hawry Flat	1,059	1,708	I	2	66	66	0
5205 North Hereford	350	0	N	0	23	23	0
5206 Whipple Gulch	1,159	0	I	0	116	116	0
5207 Hereford Valley	80	810	N	0	3	3	0

## FORAGE ALLOCATION

Allotment Number and Name		Public Land (acres)	Other Land (acres)	Management Type	Wildlife Forage (AUMs)	Livestock Use (AUMs)	Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)	Adjustment From Active Grazing Preference (AUMs)
5208	Camp Ditch	75	1422	N	0	5	5	0
5209	Camp Creek	2,798	102	I	0	141	141	0
5210	Beaverdam Creek	29	350	N	0	2	2	0
5211	King Mountain	650	2,360	N	20	28	48	-20
5212	Rock Creek	128	0	N	2	10	10	0
5215	Denny Flat	6,620	1,160	I	0	376	376	0
5216	Westcamp Creek	669	502	N	0	45	45	0
5217	Elms Reservoir	120	0	N	0	8	8	0
5218	Junction	160	718	N	0	112	112	0
5219	Dry Gulch	327	1,595	N	0	32	32	0
5220	Whitted Ditch	76	725	N	0	4	4	0
5221	China Cr.	161	0	N	0	9	9	0
5222	Meadow Cr.	40	0	N	0	4	4	0
5223	Meadow Cr.	200	0	N	0	13	13	0
5225	Job Cr.	65	0	N	0	3	3	0
5226	Cow Cr.	118	593	N	0	7	7	0
5227	Copper Cr.	235	0	N	0	20	20	0
5228	Sunflower Flat	160	0	N	0	20	20	0
5230	Middlefork	200	0	N	0	19	19	0
5233	Bullrun	32	0	N	0	4	4	0
5234	Reed Cr.	341	0	N	0	22	22	0
5235	North Fork	355	396	N	0	29	29	0
5236	Cottonwood Cr.	288	0	N	0	32	32	0
5238	Short Cr.	37	0	N	0	6	6	0
5303	Lindsay Mtn.	936	448	I	3	137	137	0
5304	Hill Cr.	292	0	N	0	27	27	0
5305	Hooker Gulch	70	615	N	0	6	6	0
5306	Dry Gulch	93	477	N	0	4	4	0
5307	Ebell Cr.	120	1,701	N	0	4	4	0
5309	Shaffner Cr.	40	345	N	0	2	2	0
5310	South Baker	279	629	N	0	25	25	0
5311	Elk Cr.	2,228	3,863	I	1	221	221	0
5312	Juniper Gulch	355	1,630	N	0	13	13	0
5313	Poker Gulch	1,424	0	N	0	96	96	0
5316	Salisbury	122	0	N	0	15	15	0
5319	Trail Cr.	710	2,665	N	0	93	93	0
5321	Auburn	2,631	0	N	18	190	83	+107
5322	Stack Cr.	54	0	N	0	5	5	0
5323	Wendt Butte	729	228	N	0	66	66	0
5325	Towne Gulch	166	1,625	N	0	32	32	0
5334	Old Auburn	72	406	N	0	6	6	0
5335	Blue Canyon	80	0	N	0	8	8	0
5337	Koontz Cr.	31	0	N	0	4	4	0
5339	Sutton Cr.	120	0	N	0	5	5	0
5340	Littlefield	40	0	N	0	2	2	0
5342	Log Cr.	73	363	N	0	12	12	0
Other		6,145	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals:		380,594	298,892		2,449	51,179	50,577	+602

I=Intensive Management N=Nonintensive Management E=Eliminate

S= Experimental stewardship program under the Public Rangelands Improvement Act (PRIA, 1978). Some of these designations may change after completion of categorization under the Selective Management policy.

\*This allotment is an example of several where a significant change in management has occurred but no changes are reflected on the chart. The forage harvest capability of this cattle herd has been reduced 13 percent by replacing the summer grazing of cows and calves with late fall grazing by dry cows or yearlings. A change in the grazing period to the cool dormant season will improve use distribution and will help meet the growth needs of the forage plants.

## APPROXIMATE PERIODS OF USE AND GRAZING SYSTEMS

Allotment Number and Name	Management Objectives'	Period of use	Seasonal	Deferred Rotation	Rotation	Rest Rotation	Existing Exclosure
1001 Snake R.-Sisley Cr.	1,2,3,4	4/23-11/31		23,001			26
1002 Iron Mtn.	3&4	4/16-10/31	1,143	3,646	—		20
1003 Cave Creek	1,3,1	4/20-10/31	—	4,743		—	130
1004 Durkee	3&4	4/16-10/31		9,154			
1006 Huntington	3&4	4/01-10/31	—	9,790			
1009 Slaughterhouse Mtn	3&4	4/10-6/15	—	797			
1013 Benson Cr.	1,3,4	4/16-10/31				3,359	
1014 Freeway		4/01-11/30		533	—		—
1015 East Table Mtn.	3&4	4/16-11/30		1,240			—
1016 Table Mtn.	1,3,4	4/16-10/31			—	7,678	
1017 Burned	1,3,4	4/16-10/31		1,254	—		
1018 Upper Durbin Cr.	3&4	3/16-10/31		1,004			
1020 Dixie Cr.	1,3,4	6/01-11/30	—	2,938			
1021 Pedro Mtn.	3&4	7/01-10/31		2,700	—		
1023 Rattlesnake Gulch	1&4	6/01-11/30		402			—
1026 North Dixie Cr.	4	6/01-11/30	—	980			
1031 Shirttail Cr.	3&4	4/16-11/30		806			
1037 Rye Valley	3&4	3/16-11/30		2,740	—		—
1039 Turner Gulch	1,3,4	4/01-12/15			—	3,746	—
1040 Little Valley	1,3,4	4/16-11/30		3,195			4
1041 Cinder Butte	3&4	4/16-11/30	—	1,540			
1044 Juniper Mtn.	1,3,4	4/01-12/15		—		2,072	—
1048 Nodine Cr.	1,3,4	6/01-11/30		3,054	—		
1066 Farewell Bend		4/16-10/31		738			
1301 South Bridgeport	1,3,4	5/01-09/30				18,105	
1302 North Bridgeport	1,3,4	5/16-10/15		10,914	—	—	
1318 Mormon Basin	1,3,4	5/01-09/15				9,724	10
1320 Mill Gulch	4	5/01-10/31				1,243	
2004 Five Mile	1,3,4	4/1-10/130				1,373	—
2005 Second Creek	1&4	4/16-12/15				3,131	
2072 Big Creek	1,2,3,4	4/16-01/15		1,546	—	1,526	
2015 Magpie Peak		4/16-11/30		2,120			
2019 Salt Creek	4	4/10-12/31	—	2,076		—	—
2020 Crews Creek	1&4	4/1-10/15		2,996	—	—	
2021 Seeding	4	4/10-05/09	400	—	—	—	
2023 Upper Pittsburgh	1&4	6/15-09/30	—	350		—	
2024 Table Rock	1,3,4	4/16-01/15		1,510		590	17
2025 Upper Spring Cr.	1&4	4/16-01/15		555			
2031 Bulldozer	4	4/16-07/15	—	—	4,006		
2032 Goose Cr.	1,3,4	4/16-12/31		—		3,853	20
2034 Love Cr.	1,3,4	4/16-01/15			—	1,784	10
2035 Waterspout	4	4/16-01/15		1,885			
2036 Table Mountain	1,3,4	5/01-10/31	—			600	
2037 Balm Cr.	1,2,3,4	5/01-07/15	—			3,943	2
2040 Spring Cr.	1,3,4	5/16-10/31		—	—	1,372	60
2041 Cottonwood Cr.	1,3,4	5/16-10/31		280	—	—	—
2048 Upper Clover Cr.	1,2,3,4	4/16-01/15		308		499	40
2050 Upper Ritter Cr.		4/16-12/15				2,688	
2055 Clover Cr.	1,3,4	4/16-12/15	—	—	—	1,016	5
2070 Summit Pasture	3&4	4/16-04/30	1,237	—			—
2071 McCann Springs		4/16-01/15	—	1,786	—	—	1
2074 Pritchard Creek	1,2,4	4/16-08/31	—	—		13,562	
2077 Ritter Creek	1&4	4/16-08/31		770			

## APPROXIMATE PERIODS OF USE AND GRAZING SYSTEMS

Allotment Number and Name	Management Objectives <sup>1</sup>	Period of use	Seasonal	Deferred Rotation	Rotation	Rest Rotation	Existing Enclosure
2078 North Flagstaff	4	4/16-12/15	—	1,802	—	—	—
2084 Powder River Canyon	1,3,4	4/16-11/30	—	1,207	—	—	—
2085 West Clover Creek	4	4/16-01/15	—	545	—	—	—
2099 Virtue Hills	3&4	6/15-09/15	—	4,210	—	—	—
2105 Love Pasture	1&4	4/16-01/15	—	1,273	—	—	2
2108 Keating Highway	4	4/16-12/15	—	1,600	—	2,786	—
2109 Ruckles Creek	1&4	4/16-01/15	—	3,687	—	2,200	16
2111 Bacher Creek*	1,3,4	4/16-01/15	—	601	—	—	4
2115 Tucker Creek	1,3,4	4/16-07/01	—	—	1,475	—	—
2116 East Balm Creek	1&4	4/01-01/15	361	722	—	—	—
2121 East Pleasant Vy	4	4/16-07/31	—	—	375	—	—
2127 Kelley Creek	1&4	4/16-01/15	—	1,705	—	—	11
2128 Risley Butte	1&4	4/16-01/15	—	2,501	—	—	—
2129 Chalk Bluff	1&4	4/16-06/15	—	—	631	—	14
3001 Pine Valley	1,3,4	4/16-06/15	25,474	—	—	—	11
3002 Immigrant Gulch	1,3,4	5/01-07/31	—	—	—	7,073	6
3003 Ruth Gulch	1,3,4	4/16-12/15	—	8,124	—	—	323
3004 Doyle Gulch	1,3,4	4/16-06/15	1,817	—	—	—	—
3005 Hunsaker Cr.	1,3,4	4/16-06/15	6,495	—	—	—	—
3006 Homestead	1,3,4	4/16-06/15	—	—	—	5,122	—
3007 Copperfield	1,3,4	4/16-06/15	—	—	2,875	—	—
3012 Squaw Cr.	3&4	4/16-11/30	4,809	—	—	—	—
3014 Timber Canyon	1,3,4	4/16-12/31	—	—	—	5,303	—
3018 Road Gulch	1,3,4	4/16-06/15	1,959	—	—	—	—
3022 Foster Gulch	3&4	5/01-11/30	—	1,679	—	—	—
3026 Soda Cr.	1,3,4	4/16-11/15	—	9,289	—	—	—
3029 Dry Gulch	3&4	4/01-09/30	—	2,516	—	—	—
3049 Barnard Cr.	1,3,4	4/16-09/30	—	1,998	—	—	—
5201 Brannon Gulch	1,3,4	5/01-10/31	—	—	—	3,247	—
5204 Hawry Flats	3&4	4/16-05/15	1,059	—	—	—	—
5206 Whipple Gulch	3&4	5/01-10/31	—	1,159	—	—	—
5209 Camp Cr.	3&4	4/16-05/31	—	—	—	2,798	—
5215 Denny Flat	3&4	4/16-06/15	—	—	—	6,520	100
5203 Lindsay Mtn.	1,3,4	4/16-07/31	—	936	—	—	—
5311 Elk Cr.	3&4	5/01-10/31	—	2,228	—	—	—

Total Acres:	44,774	151,200	9,362	115,441	832
--------------	--------	---------	-------	---------	-----

\*There are 266 acres of nonintensive managed public land that are fenced in with private ownership in allotments 2055 and 2111

<sup>1</sup>Management Objectives

1. Improve and/or maintain riparian vegetation
2. Improve water quality and quantity
3. Maintain and/or improve wildlife habitat
4. Maintain and/or improve ecosite condition

**RANGE IMPROVEMENT (RI.) PROGRAM'**

Allotment Number <sup>1</sup>	Seeding (acres)	Brush Control (acres)	Fence (miles)	Sprgs.	Reserv.	Pipeline (miles)	Estimated <sup>2</sup> Federal R.I. Costs (\$000)	Total <sup>3</sup> Ben./Cost	Total <sup>3</sup> Benefit/ Federal Cost	Priority for Fed. Investment
Allotment Name										
1001 Snake R.-Sisley Cr.	3 200	3 120	8	2			\$ 66	1.45	2 16	1
1002 Iron Mountain			1	1	2	1	8	.75	1 20	23
1003 Cave Creek	60	800	—	2		.5	5	1.44	2.74	11
1004 Durkee		520	4	—	2		10	.87	1.33	24
1006 Huntington	560	670	—	6	—		12	.93	1 5 5	2
1013 Benson Cr	440	600	2		1		11	1.19	1.65	41
1075 East Table Mtn.		—	2		—	—	1	.82	3.47	26
1016 Table Mtn.		—	—		2	2	30	.86	1.44	3
1018 Upper Durbin Cr.	—	200	—	—	—		1	1 14	2.09	48
1020 Dixie Cr.		—		1		1	5	.91	1.18	29
1037 Rye Valley		1,410	—	2		—	7	1.10	1 93	30
1039 Turner Gulch				3	—		3	.89	1.98	13
1040 Little Valley	—	440					1	1.41	2 60	39
1041 Cinder Butte		—		—		.5	2	2 08	3.39	40
1044 Juniper Mtn				4		—	4	1.38	3.75	12
1048 Nodrne Cr			3	2	—		3	.76	3.43	55
1066 Farewell Bend	—	280			—		1	1 08	1.98	62
1301 South Bridgeport		1,200	2	4		—	23	.98	1.44	31
1302 Nor-th Bridgeport	300	600		6			15	1 45	2.26	10
1318 Mormon Basin		1,710	2	4	—		21	.98	1.27	49
2004 Five Mile		—	3		—		4	.56	1.38	63
2005 Second Creek	—	600		—			5	.75	1.19	54
2012 Big Cr.	—		—	1			3	1.74	2 40	58
2015 Magpie Peak		500				5	1	.76	3 62	9
2019 Salt Cr.		—	—		1		3	1 25	1.25	37
2020 Crews Cr.		—	1		—		17	.59	1.20	36
2021 Seeding						1	2	1 18	1 81	50
2023 Upper Pittsburg	—		—	1			2	.58	.94	51
2025 Upper Spring Cr.	—	—		1	—		2	.83	1.32	27
2031 Bulldozer		—	3		—	1	1	7.07	34.69	19
2032 Goose Cr	—		—	1	1	1	5	.69	1.06	28
2034 Love Cr.	—			2		—	3	.75	1.21	22
2036 Table Mtn.	—			1	—	—	2	1 21	1.96	38
2037 Balm Cr.	—	120		—			1	2 29	2.29	20
2041 Cottonwood Cr	—	—	—	1		—	3	.72	1.01	52
2055 Clover Cr.	350	—		2	—	—	9	.61	1 27	6
2070 Summit Pasture	—		1	—		2	7	.62	1.03	53
2071 McCann Springs	1,000	—	2		—	1	0	.45	—	
2074 Pritchard Flat		760	—	7	1		5	2.22	3 37	17
2077 Hitter Cr.		—	.5	1	—	5	3	.72	1.26	35
2078 North Flagstaff						2	0	.13	—	
2084 Powder River Canyon				2			3	1 95	2 45	46
2085 West Clover Cr.	—	—	1	—			1	3.53	9.09	47
2099 Virtue Hills		—	3		—	3	21	.64	1 4 3	8
2105 Love Pasture	360		1	1	—		0			
2108 Keating Highway	1,600		2			6	0	.97		
2109 Ruckles Cr.	1,000	1,320	4	1		4	34	.86	1.29	45
2115 Tucker Cr		350	1	3	—	—	6	.80	1.33	7
2116 East Balm Cr.	440	—	—			—	5	1.79	1.79	64
2121 East Pleasant Valley		—	—	—		.5	1	5.50	14.64	65
2127 Kelly Cr.		—	2	—			3	1.18	2.64	59
2128 Risley Butte			1	1	—	1	7	1.2%	7.50	60
2129 Chalk Bluff		—	—	1		—	2	.62	.99	61

**RANGE IMPROVEMENT (R.I.) PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Allotment Number/ Allotment Name</b>	<b>Seeding (acres)</b>	<b>Brush Control (acres)</b>	<b>Fence (miles)</b>	<b>Sprgs.</b>	<b>Reserv.</b>	<b>Pipeline (miles)</b>	<b>Estimated<sup>2</sup> Federal R.I. Costs (\$000)</b>	<b>Total<sup>3</sup> Ben./Cost</b>	<b>Total<sup>3</sup> Benefit/ Federal Cost</b>	<b>Priority for Fed. Investment</b>
3001 Pine Valley	2,880	1,710	—	4	2	—	\$ 43	1.59	1.69	4
3002 Imigrant Gulch	—	—	—	3	—	1	8	.98	1.04	57
3003 Ruth Gulch	—	—	—	2	2	—	9	1.07	1.88	16
3004 Doyle Gulch	200	—	—	—	—	—	1	2.96	10.01	44
3006 Homestead	600	—	2	3	—	—	6	.83	1.93	42
3007 Copperfield	200	—	—	2	—	—	2	1.18	4.42	43
3012 Squaw Cr.	—	270	4	5	1	—	13	.96	1.63	34
3014 Timber Canyon	580	—	—	1	—	—	9	1.11	1.15	56
3018 Road Gulch	—	—	2	2	—	—	6	.72	1.06	32
3022 Foster Gulch	—	—	—	2	—	—	4	1.04	1.15	33
3026 Soda Cr.	300	—	3	3	—	2	7	3.09	5.97	5
3029 Dry Gulch	—	—	2	2	—	1	6	.88	1.56	15
3049 Barnard Cr.	—	—	1	—	—	1	3	1.34	2.04	25
5209 Camp Cr.	—	700	—	1	—	—	5	1.20	1.39	18
5215 Denny Flat	—	2,500	—	3	—	—	12	.98	1.36	14
5303 Lindsay Mtn.	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	1.40	1.53	21
<b>Totals</b>	<b>14,070</b>	<b>20,630</b>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>\$525</b>			

<sup>1</sup>These are proposed projects and may change as the allotment plans are finalized or funding levels change.

<sup>2</sup>Costs shown here are based on 1980 values. Two wells, one guzzler, and five cattleguards are included in this Range Improvement program.

<sup>3</sup>The benefit/cost data were computed using a discount rate of 7.625 percent. The first column shows the result of dividing the total benefit by the total cost and the second column is the result of dividing the total benefit by only Federal costs.

## **Natural Resource Conservation**

As the Nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This include fostering the wisest use of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places, and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The Department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to assure that their development is in the best interests of all our people. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island Territories under U.S. administration.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
**Bureau of Land Management**

